

## REMARKS

Claims 59-81 remain in the present application. Claims 39-58 are cancelled herein. Claims 59-81 is added herein. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments. Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

### Examiner Interview Summary

A telephonic Examiner Interview was conducted on July 15, 2010 between Examiner Cory Almeida and Applicant's representative Bryan M. Failing. It was agreed during the Examiner Interview on July 15, 2010 that the Reamey reference fails to teach or suggest determining a parameter using a lookup table. It was also agreed during the Examiner Interview on July 15, 2010 that all instances of "Shapiro" in the rejection should be changed to "Reamey." Further, it was agreed during the Examiner Interview on July 15, 2010 that all instances of "5298892" in the rejection should be changed to "5113272." Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting the interview.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

#### Claims 39-58

Claims 39-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by United States Patent Number 5,113,272 to Reamey (referred to herein as "Reamey"). Claims 39-58 are cancelled herein, and thus, Applicants

respectfully submit that a discussion of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of Claims 39-58 is moot.

#### Claims 59-81

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to independent Claim 59 that recites a method of controlling a display device comprising (emphasis added):

accessing data operable to display a first image on a first display of said display device, wherein said display device further comprises a second display, wherein said first and second displays overlap, wherein said second display is operable to display a second image, wherein said first and second displays are operable to display a plurality of colors;

determining a parameter associated with a portion of said first image displayed in a first region of said first display, wherein said first region comprises an area less than the entire area of said first display; and

dynamically adjusting a second region of said second display to present said portion of said first image in accordance with said parameter, wherein a position of said second region of said second display is aligned with a position of said first region of said first display to selectively control an amount of said light associated with said first region.

Independent Claims 67 and 74 recite elements similar to independent Claim 59.

Claims 60-66, 68-73 and 75-81 recite further elements of the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that Reamey fails to teach or suggest the elements of “determining a parameter associated with a portion of said first image displayed in a first region of said first display” and “dynamically adjusting a second region of said second display to present said portion of said first image in accordance with said parameter” as recited in independent Claim 59. As described in the present application, a parameter is determined which is associated with a portion of a first image displayed in a first region of a first

display. A second region of a second display is dynamically adjusted to present the portion of the first image in accordance with the parameter. In this manner, a region of one display is adjusted to affect the display of an image on another display.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicant fails to find any teaching or suggestion in Reamey of determining a parameter associated with a portion of a first image displayed in a first region on a first display as claimed. Additionally, Applicant fails to find any teaching or suggestion in Reamey of dynamically adjusting a second region of a second display to present a portion of the first image (e.g., displayed on another display) in accordance with the parameter as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant reiterates that Reamey fails to teach or suggest the elements of “determining a parameter associated with a portion of said first image displayed in a first region of said first display” and “dynamically adjusting a second region of said second display to present said portion of said first image in accordance with said parameter” as recited in independent Claim 59.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 59 is not anticipated by Reamey. Since independent Claims 67 and 74 recite elements similar to independent Claim 59, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 67 and 74 are also not anticipated by Reamey. Since Claims 60-66, 68-73 and 75-81 recite further elements of the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims

60-66, 68-73 and 75-81 are also not anticipated by Reamey. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 59-81 are allowable.

#### General Remarks

The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are believed to be sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art of record. However, Applicant respectfully reserves the right to respond to one or more of the Examiner's rejections in subsequent amendments should conditions arise warranting such responses.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 59-81 are in condition for allowance and Applicant earnestly solicits such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 10 / 19 / 2010

/BMF/

Bryan M. Failing  
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060